

*As delivered
16 Mar. 1972.*

8 March 1972

CIRIS

As Mr. Fitts has discussed with you, the Consolidated Intelligence Resources Information System (CIRIS) is the current iteration of a long-standing interagency effort to acquire and process in an orderly and useful manner information concerning national intelligence community-wide resources and their use.

In the current time frame and in the structure of tasks levied on the DCI, I ~~believe there are several significant~~ ^{have six} points to ~~be made~~ ^{make} regarding the construction and use of CIRIS.

1. In the ~~recent~~ past the system has contained largely static and historical data. We believe it should be made into a dynamic system--capable of reflecting change in a more timely manner. The issue is how dynamic ^{can} ~~should~~ it be made?

2. What uses will be made of CIRIS? We believe it can serve throughout the community to respond to quite a variety of needs of individual Program Managers and various senior management echelons. Specifically, it can:

a. Display community fiscal and manpower resources in totality or by any combination desired.

- b. Display the amount of effort by programs,
functions, sensors, targets or cost categories.
- c. Illuminate areas to provide the basis for issue
studies.

By the same token, there are things we should identify
at the outset which CIRIS will not and should not do:

It should not

- a. [^]Be used as a sole and direct basis for management
decisions.
- b. Cannot measure effectiveness.
- c. Can display the "mix" but cannot tell the proper "mix".
- d. Cannot tell what amount or direction of change will
produce improvement in a given area.

All of these "cannots" underscore the point that CIRIS must
be used as a mangement tool, a device to point the way toward matters
requiring study in depth, and then providing certain basic data to
facilitate such studies. The results ~~thus~~ obtainable will contribute to
resource level recommendations, development of planning guidance,
and greater visibility for problem areas.

Also, we must recognize that no single system can be all
things for all people. CIRIS can perform some tasks better than it
can do others. Part of the continuing R&D aspect of CIRIS is to test
its capabilities and adjust its focus.

3. Except within NSA and CIA, we are not aware of any established centralized management information system, either for an individual program or groupings of programs, which can reflect on a common basis many of the needs of the community. We believe such a system is needed. To provide one is a reasonable and necessary function of the DCI; and CIRIS provides the foundation for such a development.

4. Several improvements are needed to make CIRIS more complete, more precise and more responsive to the variety of purposes that can be served by a proper management information system. The most effective use of CIRIS for DCI staff needs is now under study within the DCI Staff by an ad hoc committee of which I am the chairman. We propose extending this study to the community for a complete identification of purposes to be served and means of responding. ~~To do so, we want the Interagency CIRIS Committee to be considerably more active than was possible last year.~~

5. Concurrently, CIRIS needs to be made less burdensome to the various echelons and activities asked to input raw data. We believe that some improvements have been made in this direction in the Instructions and Guidance for calendar year 1972. More can be done. This point also is included in the current DCI study, ~~and the Interagency CIRIS Committee should participate in the development of improvements.~~

which I believe is currently in your promulgation.

⑥ A final point to be made is to identify the fact that the CY72 target structure has been harmonized with the objectives stated in DCID 1/2 and Annex A of the JSOP. *U.S. Intelligence Objectives and Priorities.*

I would now like to discuss each of these major points in more detail in order to arrive at an understanding of the DCI objectives and the community usefulness of CIRIS or whatever other management information system may evolve from it.

Point 1: Make CIRIS dynamic

Past TOD and CIRIS data calls for targeted information have been issued each spring and have covered the approved (current) fiscal year and the budget year. For example the CY71 CIRIS data call for function and target-oriented data covered FY71 approved resources and FY72 resources as requested in the President's budget. The data were received, entered into the system and were available for display by about July 1971. Aberrations to the FY72 program and budget occurred since these data were provided. These changes in resource levels are command decisions. Due to these rapid changes, CIRIS data on FY72 is useful for multi-year trend analysis but was not very helpful for CDIP Program Review. FY71, now an historical year, is the most reliable function and target-oriented information CIRIS can currently display. ~~Our task, therefore, is to identify which parts of CIRIS can serve which kinds of users in timely fashion.~~

We have not had access to all the decision documents and FYDP updates which would enable us to keep CIRIS fiscal data relatively current with changes made in the FY72 budget and resource allocations. In fact, even as of now--March 1972--we do not have firm and official figures on what has happened to the allocation of FY72 resources, and we are nearly three-quarters of the way through the year.

This year we are proposing that the data call request submissions showing functional and target orientation for FY72 actual, FY73 as requested in the President's budget, and FY74 as programmed.

FY-74 data represents a special problem. This, of course, is the Program Year and will be the focus of the CDIP review and the follow-on budget preparation this coming fall. At present, however, we are early in calendar year 1972 and we all recognize the very tentative nature of the FY-74 planning figures. Accordingly, we do not propose that FY-74 be target oriented this spring.

However, the Office of Management and Budget has put continuing strong pressure on us to develop function and target oriented displays for FY-74. Their view has been that the data should be collected based on the January 72 FYDP--in spite of its tentative nature--and should be recollected around mid-year following program

reviews. We recognize the logic of preparing a picture showing changes in FY-74 levels in the course of the PPB cycle. But we believe the burden on data inputters would be great, time delays in submissions would be inevitable, and the value of the information obtained not commensurate with the effort expended.

We propose the following course of action for FY-74 data:

✓ (a) No data call for function and target oriented information from the field.

✓ (b) Rather, the CIRIS staff will undertake to develop and test procedures whereby FY-74 function and target allocations of resources can be computed by extrapolation. ~~This exercise will draw on the fiscal summary data by Reporting Entity to be provided to GIRIS following completion of the mid-year program reviews. It will also draw on the entity submissions for FY-72 and FY-73.~~ This should provide a reasonable picture of FY-74 for our use, and it should provide evidence to OMB that we are taking practicable steps in accordance with their views.

Mr. Tweedy's request to you for official distribution of certain program documents, including decision documents and FYDP updates, was intended to assist in this process. We believe that the ability to enter these data into the system in a timely manner will help us achieve a more dynamic display of greater usefulness to the entire community. This, of course, implies cooperation from the individual Program Managers to provide the more detailed impact of decisions on the elements and sub-elements of their programs. We realize that it takes time for the individual units, the Military Services, Program Managers and various comptrollers to translate decisions into

actions and to readjust their internal records showing resource allocation. Our only desire is to get these changes as promptly as possible in order that we can provide as timely an output as possible of consolidated data in various pertinent displays. This naturally leads to my next point--who will use CIRIS and for what?

Point 2: The Use of CIRIS

We have two objectives under this point: (1) that CIRIS should be useful to higher management levels throughout the entire community, and (2) that CIRIS should provide ~~on a homogeneous basis~~ the data necessary to initiate and conduct comparisons, evaluations and deeper examinations into specific issue areas. One reason for TOD was to get away from competing data calls on ad hoc issues; these calls frequently used conflicting vocabularies and hence produced non-comparable data. Those issue analyses, however, are not part of the CIRIS group. Their proper task is to design, test, and operate the system objectively. They should not be charged with participation in issue analysis and advocacy. That is a job for the user, not the system operator.

As I said, CIRIS should not serve as the immediate basis for specific resource decisions at any echelon. This means that CIRIS should be structured to show changes in a relatively current time frame but should be devoid of the full intimate detail which would be the basis for making specific individual decisions. Stated differently,

if CIRIS is dynamic but somewhat gross, the users of the system will find it useful as a frame of reference but will be compelled to look deeper and give more deliberate consideration before arriving at resource decisions.

As to specific uses to which CIRIS can be put, I have some examples.

✓ Example 1. This shows the distribution of the intelligence dollar among the listed functions. $PI = 66^4$ ↓

✓ Example 2. This is a percentage distribution of the three elements of the Positive Intelligence function.

✓ Example 3. This is the distribution of collection costs and their relative percentages among the major sensor types.

✓ Example 4. Geographic targeting of resources is a prime capability of CIRIS. This chart shows the percentage of collection and production effort worldwide.

Closed societies - USSR & CC - require greater coll. effort than prod. In all other areas, prod. effort is higher than coll.

✓ Example 5. Taking the production column from the previous chart, this is the breakout of effort by the three production activities of national intelligence according to the same geographic spread.

The USSR is the top priority target for both the Department of Defense and CIA, but ranks sixth on the State Department list. Communist China, which is second in proportion of effort by CIA, is third in Defense but ranks lowest of all in State. The

prominence of East Asia/Western Pacific in the community total as well as in all production programs is primarily because it includes the SEA area of hostilities.

FY71 de

✓ Example 6. This chart shows some further breakouts of production costs--by Communist and non-Communist and by military and non-military. The geographic spreads are the same as on previous charts except for the addition of specific Communist countries of North Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba.

Non-Comm
is on
second
chart.

As you can see, nearly 80% of our total production is against Communist targets, and the purely military portion of this is 85% even higher. In non-military production, the community is divided almost equally between Communist and non-Communist areas.

Summary of Examples

I am drawing no conclusions from this variety of relatively simple examples of CIRIS data displays.

They may show some rather surprising imbalances, such as in collection versus production or in the cost of imagery collection versus HUMINT collection. They show a substantially smaller effort against Communist China as compared with the USSR.

Some of these simple displays may lead one to ask, "Why?" That is a primary purpose of CIRIS--to illuminate areas requiring deeper study.

These simple displays are the result of much data manipulation and analysis from CIRIS.

Point 3: Need for an Information System

The fact that the Program Managers' information systems are not homogeneous ~~to which I have already referred~~ is not meant to be a criticism of them. ~~To a large extent, the environment needed to cause creation of a community-wide system to identify the many aspects of intelligence has not existed until very recent years.~~

CIA's Office of Planning, Programming and Budgeting has a system which is effective for management of the highly centralized structure of the Agency. But its current capability is maximized toward fiscal management rather than being a system that can now make measurement of proper resource allocation and resource effectiveness. The CIA system works well for CIA because the Agency is centralized and has high personnel continuity in programming and budgeting. The NSA structure with the Service Cryptologic Agencies is more complicated organizationally and programatically, but the NSA mission is concerned with discrete functions which lend themselves to central management. Both the CIA and NSA internal management information systems are presumably appropriate for agency purposes, but are not designed to fill community needs in a manner compatible with management information on all the community programs.

Last fall the DASD(I) Staff discussed with DIA the possibility of asking DIA to accept responsibility for creating and maintaining a DOD intelligence management information system. This system

would, among other things, be designed to support the needs of your office and staff for management information. So far as I know, this proposition is still in the discussion stage with no specific development of a system having been undertaken.

Such a DOD system could be structured within the framework of CIRIS or, of course, completely apart from it. ~~Of course,~~ We believe any such system should be compatible with CIRIS. The community cannot afford two systems and certainly not two incompatible systems. That was recognized and settled in the discussions preceding the first TOD.

Preliminary estimates from DIA concluded that at least 18 months would be required to create the nucleus of a Defense system if undertaken independent of CIRIS. Some thought this amount of time was overly optimistic. The cost of such a development was estimated at \$400,000, and some thought the cost would be at least double that amount. By comparison, the computer support already invested over 4-5 years in TOD/CIRIS is in excess of \$500,000.

Measured against these contemplations, I submit that CIRIS exists today as a reasonably effective management information system readily adaptable to community needs, including the very substantial Defense portion.

CIRIS has been criticized in the past. Some of this criticism was valid as the new and complicated system evolved.

Question

However, could one reasonably expect any worthwhile mechanism to describe a three billion dollar industry not to be somewhat complex?

Much of the criticism was not so valid in that it came from those who were aware of the detail being sought without knowing the ultimate purposes to be served. ~~Others who criticized the system were those who could and should have been users of it, but declined to do so.~~ Thus, they never were able to appreciate the uses to which it could be put nor were they in a position to be helpful in modifying the system to make it less troublesome or more responsive.

We must accept the fact that the DCI needs some sort of community information system in order to carry out his assigned roles. ~~Mr. Fitts' historical survey makes that abundantly clear, and also identifies many parameters for design of that system.~~ The present CIRIS is responsive to quite a number of needs, but it requires further development. To reduce the cost of system development, to limit data calls on otherwise busy program managers and reporting activities, and to have a system which will perform a service of common concern, we consider that CIRIS, modified as necessary, is that community system. Our present task is, therefore, to improve the existing community system.

To that end, my remaining three discussion points relate to system improvement actions, easing of the data call burden, and

the already-accomplished restructuring to reflect current DOD and community-wide statements of objectives and requirements.

Point 4: CIRIS Improvement Study

As the CY72 CIRIS data call was being developed and in recognition of concern about CIRIS known to exist in the community, Mr. Tweedy in mid-January set up a study group to review CIRIS and to recommend modifications required to make the data system more responsive to the in-house needs of the DCI and his supporting staff. This study is now under way with completion scheduled for 1 July, or sooner.

The approach being taken in this study is to identify the specific needs of the four principal elements of the DCI Community Staff--comptroller, plans and evaluation, product review, and long-range analysis. Each of these groups is represented on the study team, and our initial action has been to identify the work of these staff groups which can or needs to be supported by CIRIS-type data, either existing or as modified. In addition to the DCI Community Staff, we expect USIB committees to look to CIRIS, particularly since the USIB Committee structure is now also charged with serving the IRAC.

Without attempting to pre-judge the outcome of the study, I can give ^{you} some insight into the needs we have identified.

Comptroller: This type of support is fairly clear-cut because it involves essentially print-outs of dollar and manpower levels by different years and in various arrays such as by program, by function and by cost category. I personally believe that this support is little more than mechanical and is probably the least unique as a CIRIS capability. However, during the past year, the DCI's CIRIS staff has developed new capabilities for the rapid manipulation of fiscal data using new computer programs.

Plans and Evaluation: This should be one of the areas deriving the greatest support from CIRIS. It is contemplated that the DCI will issue annually a community planning guidance document. This guidance should review where we are in our total intelligence community effort, where we should be going and thus where there needs to be changes in emphasis. These changes need to be stated in program terms which can be translated into resource programming by the program managers and also serve as a basis subsequently for determining measures of program achievement by various review levels. An effective management information system will be the foundation upon which this type of program planning guidance will be built. The quality and timeliness of CIRIS data and the ability to break it out in a number of different ways, particularly in the function, target and resource application areas, will be directly reflected in the quality and usefulness of the planning guidance.

The evaluation function will be the most continuous user of CIRIS, and these uses should see the greatest variety of data base application. This function will represent the conduct of issue studies, effectiveness evaluations and result in resource level recommendations. As I said earlier, CIRIS displays will point to areas where issue studies should be considered and can be used to prove or disprove theoretical assertions. CIRIS data provide a frame of reference for undertaking such studies. ~~These data are made up of statistics submitted by the Program Managers themselves in a common language.~~

Moreover, this application need not and should not be limited to the DCI Staff. All Program Managers and senior review levels should have equal access to the data for similar purposes, and the data files should be structured to support all such needs.

Product Review: This is the newest element of the DCI Staff and one whose objectives and methodologies are still evolving. Its interests are highly substantive, and its needs are likely to be sophisticated. Nevertheless, the ability of CIRIS to support the effort is already established on the basis of earlier planning studies from which some of the examples I showed you are drawn. ~~Although partially formed by the arrays in CIRIS on the Production function, this represents the culmination of all other efforts in the intelligence community and should be the most significant type of effort supported~~

~~by CIRIS.~~ The system will also be available to support similar efforts undertaken within individual programs, particularly by DIA.

Long-range analysis: Since this effort will, in the main, be a projection beyond the five-year period covered by the programming system, CIRIS support will be essentially for comparative purposes or to serve as a base from which to project. The long-range analysis will, however, be an essential ingredient in the program planning guidance, and a dynamic CIRIS will provide the yardstick by which program achievement is measured.

USIB/IRAC Committees: The ^{Critical Collection Problems Committee} ~~CCPC~~ is depending on CIRIS to help maintain the Facilities Inventory. Other committees, such as ^{a/s} ~~Economic Intelligence~~, will be users.

Other Uses: I am sure there are other useful applications of CIRIS-type data among Program Managers or senior management review echelons. In order that these can be identified and their support provided for, it appears desirable to extend the CIRIS study effort to the whole intelligence program community. If you desire such participation by your staff and your program managers, we are prepared to make the necessary provision for you to participate directly with us. ~~Thus~~ ^{We} would hope to incorporate the greatest number of desired revisions into our planning for the CY73 data call and CIRIS structure.

DCI
ASD(I) Staff
DIA
Mil. Services
Special Programs

~~We believe the best way to do this is to translate the present Interagency CIRIS Committee into an IRAC Committee. The DCI will provide the Chairman and Executive Secretary as is customary. Membership will include representation from ASD(I), State, OMB, DIA, NSA, and the Services. The special Programs will also be covered and they will have representation, but owing to the compartmental^{ed} nature of their interests, they may decide to participate selectively. I propose the DCI take this action immediately.~~

Point 5: Make CIRIS less burdensome

The detail required of many relatively low-echelon reporting entities, particularly among GDIP activities, has been the source of the greatest amount of probably valid criticism of CIRIS. I believe there are ways to simplify this.

Much of the function and target data called for each year is either available from Program Managers in Washington (to include the Military Service headquarters) or is not likely to have significant change year after year. This suggests that data calls could be structured to confine most inputs to the Washington level. We could leave to the discretion of each Program Manager how much input he requires from the field and at what intervals.

These are some thoughts on how we could reduce the reporting burden. They have not been explored in depth, but it would appear

beneficial to consult with the program managers and perhaps the Services on such actions. So, if you would agree to join in our CIRIS improvement study, we would solicit ideas on these simplification actions as well as on your system support requirements.

Point 6: DCID 1/2

U.S. Intelligence Objectives
and Priorities.

The instructions already prepared for the CY72 CIRIS data call describe how the new USIB-agreed DCID 1/2 objectives list has been harmonized to a considerable degree with the CIRIS structure. We hope to go further with this during the year. This same compatibility, of course, applies to the objectives listed in Annex A of JSOP because the two lists were prepared in consonance with each other. Thus CIRIS will have an increasing capability to display resources against Objectives; these displays can be evaluated against the Priorities assigned by DCID 1/2 in further analyses using CIRIS data as a take-off point.

~~In this first iteration of applying DCID 1/2, CIRIS relates its targets to about 90 percent of the stated Objectives. The first six Objectives relating to "Warning" were not included because resources are generally not separately targetable against these. Additionally, the two Objectives for "Target Information" were not included because of the very wide variety of resources from which target materials can come. The DCI's CIRIS group and the General Jack Thomas' Product Review Group are working on this.~~

71
Objectives

The relating of the DCID 1/2 Objectives to CIRIS will certainly improve with time and experience, and we can anticipate a display where a greater proportion of our total resources will be targeted against the specific topics constituting our agreed-upon national and command intelligence objectives.

This will provide maximum visibility to resource utilization.

~~++++~~
This presentation has given you the history leading to the present status of a community intelligence management information system, ~~a description of how the present system is structured and used~~ and our views of the future system development and utilization.

We urge ~~your favorable consideration of~~ *that you take a hard, objective look at* this system as the basis for a Defense intelligence management information system.

We encourage greater use of the system by your Program Managers and your staff.

In particular, we are counting on continuing Defense participation in CIRIS improvement in order that Defense needs can be identified and also Defense ideas for system improvement can be applied. CIRIS has now attained some useful operational capabilities. A continuation of our effort to develop, test, validate and improve the practical capabilities of CIRIS continues to be in our mutual interest, ~~just as it was some 5 years ago when DOD and DCI made the basic agreement to go down this road together.~~